

BOOK REVIEWS.

Disease of the Pancreas; Its Cause and Nature.—By Eugene L. Opie, M. D., Associate in Pathology in the Johns Hopkins University; Fellow of the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research, Philadelphia. J. B. Lippincott Company. Price, \$3.00.

Medical book readers are rapidly learning the value of special works upon individual organs by the author whose tastes, training and attainments are a guaranty of good faith and earnestness. This is clearly apparent in the acceptability of journal literature of the higher type, and is manifest in the voluminous references to such sources of information by writers in every language.

The work before us is a conspicuous example of meritorious effort along this line and it may be safely said that Dr. Opie has given to the profession the best monograph upon the pancreas, its structure, its function, its pathology and its relationship to other organs in health and disease that has ever appeared in English. The work must be read to be fully appreciated and as an aid to diagnosis and to differential diagnosis it will prove invaluable.

The etiology of hemorrhagic pancreatitis is reviewed at length, and the author's deductions are altogether convincing. The same may be said of the chapters devoted to the association of acute pancreatitis with fall bladder and gall disease. The discussion of fat necrosis as related to pancreatic lesions brings forward all that has been determined thus far, either experimentally or clinically.

The author's review of the pathology of diabetes mellitus and its relation to lesions of the islands of Langerhans places before the English student a complete summary of the world's present knowledge upon this subject. The work is liberally illustrated and its value greatly enhanced by a copious and comprehensive bibliography. It is to be hoped that a second edition will place a correct estimate upon the value of very recent investigations relative to the conditions governing the activity of the gland as well as the action of the newly discovered secretin.

THOS. W. HUNTINGTON.

The STATE JOURNAL acknowledges the receipt of a pamphlet on "Technique of Cholecystostomy, and a New Method of Abdominal Suturing," and reprint of paper on "A Few Practical Points in the Technic of Nephorrhaphy and Herniotomy; and a New Modification of Alexander's Operation," by F. P. Canae-Marquis, M. D., of the French Hospital staff, San Francisco.

AN UNUSUAL INFECTION CAUSING ACUTE SUPPURATIVE APPENDICITIS.

(Continued from page 254.)

anaerobic bacteria. Very recently in the Hunterian lecture upon the pathology of appendicitis not one reference was made to this all-important subject,

which the French school has studied most carefully ever since Pasteur, in 1861, first isolated and cultivated the first anaerobic micro-organism. In 1889, while working in the Pasteur Institute at Paris, I saw considerable attention given to this class of bacteria, and during the past five years, excellent results have been obtained, especially in the study of otitis, gangrene of the lung, urinary infections and angio-cholitis and appendicitis. In a series of 22 cases of appendicitis reported in the *French Archives of Experimental Medicine* in the latter part of 1898, a most careful bacteriologic search showed the presence of anaerobic bacteria in every case but one, this being a mild pneumococcal infection. In many cases the lesions were solely due to the anaerobes. The most practical method of studying anaerobes is with the Liborius tube, as modified by Veillon, which permits of an easy segregation of the aerobic, facultative and obligatory anaerobic bacteria. In conclusion, I would suggest that we resort to the more accurate methods of bacteriologic diagnosis, even if such methods be delicate and require several weeks to investigate a single case.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SCAMP AND CRIMINAL.

Visalia, July 27, 1903.

To the California State Journal of Medicine:—The following is reported for its interest to the profession all over the State, because of its bearing on the State law regarding practice, and also because we are rid of one man who was practicing in violation of the law and seemed to have very little trouble to follow the work.

On Wednesday of last week F. N. Martin, who advertised himself as "The Herb King," was found guilty of rape committed on the person of one of his patients, a feeble-minded girl, who had been under his treatment for epilepsy for several months. The jury was out about twenty minutes, returning with a verdict of guilty as charged. He was sentenced to serve thirty years in the State Prison at Folsom.

He obtained the same class of business that such traveling quacks generally find in any town, but among them were some people of influence and money.

The District Attorney was advised of his violation of the law and had an interview with him, telling him he would be prosecuted if he did not quit his work. He left this place, but soon returned with a Dr. B. F. Weaver, holding certificate No. 4904, and commenced practice, claiming to make drugs which Dr. Weaver would use in his practice, and advertising that he could be found at his old place of business. As soon as he commenced this work he was at once arrested and placed under a \$500 bond for practicing medicine without a license.

He was tried twice, the jury failing to agree on a verdict. During both trials an attempt was made by his attorneys to show that he was the subject of jealousy and persecution by the medical profession of this town; but members of the profession here had talked very little, and not one of them put his foot in the court room during the trial.

Between his trials and during the last, he had printed a letter to the public, signed by fifteen of his patients. This letter was printed daily in the papers here, and stated that all had been using his medicine and could not live without it, and they saw no reason why the law should step in and take from them the privilege of buying this medicine. One of the names signed to the letter was that of the

mother of the girl upon whom he committed the rape.

There is one thing about the matter in which the profession here can take considerable satisfaction and that is most of his friends paid dearly for their experience. Three of them signed notes given to his attorneys to fight the cases in which he was charged with illegal practice of medicine, and I have been told that each trial cost him \$500; those friends paid the charges.

The fight made by the District Attorney's office of this place was a hard one, and it was on account of the great expense attached to defending himself that we were hopeful of getting rid of Martin, had he not been guilty of far greater charges. From the testimony given in the rape case, it appears that Martin's victim was afflicted with epilepsy, and had been since the age of three. Her mind, which is weakened, was made more so by reason of three hard convulsions she had the evening before the assault.

I am glad to say that none of Martin's adherents had a hand in his defense in the latter charge, and it would be very easy now to have him convicted on the first charge were he to stand trial for practicing medicine without a license. We regret very much that it takes a serious criminal charge to make it possible to secure a jury in a community to convict a quack for practicing without a license, when the case was such a plain violation of the law as his case was.

The daily papers here gave no help in trying to point out why a man should be disqualified under the law to practice medicine, and one paper gave Martin some help because he did some advertising with it.

The same condition confronted those of the profession here who started things moving against Martin that confronts the profession in general, when they agree to comply with higher requirements and ask that they be made in order to secure a license.

We were accused of jealousy and fear of losing business, but I doubt very much if any regular practitioner here has suffered one bit by reason of any quack's methods in the place. We feel that the profession is degraded by quack methods, and feel certain the people at large are the ones protected by the law. We feel no little humiliation that the local papers will not discourage the methods of such people, but instead render them assistance because of a few advertisements, when they know the profession does not permit advertising except in the matter of a card in their professional list.

Very truly yours,
W. W. CROSS.

PRINCIPLES OF MEDICAL ETHICS.

(Continued from page 270.)

SEC. 2.—The physician, in his intercourse with a patient, under care of another physician, should observe the strictest caution and reserve; should give no disingenuous hints relative to the nature and treatment of the patient's disorder, nor should the course of conduct of the physician directly or indirectly tend to diminish the trust reposed in the attending physician.

SEC. 3.—The same circumspection should be observed when, from motives of business or friendship, a physician is prompted to visit a person who is under the direction of another physician. Indeed, such visits should be avoided, except under peculiar circumstances; and when they are made, no inquiries should be instituted relative to the nature of the disease, or the remedies employed, but the topic of conversation should be as foreign to the case as circumstances will admit.

ARTICLE III.—THE DUTIES OF PHYSICIANS IN REGARD TO CONSULTATIONS.

SECTION 1.—The broadest dictates of humanity should be obeyed by physicians whenever and wherever their services are needed to meet the emergencies of disease or accident.

SEC. 2.—Consultations should be promoted in difficult cases, as they contribute to confidence and more enlarged views of practice.

SEC. 3.—The utmost punctuality should be observed in the visits of physicians when they are to hold consultations, and this is generally practicable, for society has been so considerate as to allow the plea of a professional engagement to take precedence over all others.

SEC. 4.—As professional engagements may sometimes cause delay in attendance the physician who first arrives should wait for a reasonable time, after which the consultation should be considered as postponed to a new appointment.

SEC. 5.—In consultations no insincerity, rivalry, or envy should be indulged; candor, probity and all due respect should be observed toward the physician in charge of the case.

SEC. 6.—No statement or discussion of the case should take place before the patient or friends, except in the presence of all the physicians attending, or by their common consent; and no opinions or prognostications should be delivered which are not the result of previous deliberation and concurrence.

SEC. 7.—No decision should restrain the attending physician from making such subsequent variations in the mode of treatment as any unexpected change in the character of the case may demand. But at the next consultation reasons for the variations should be stated. The same privilege, with its obligation, belongs to the consultant when sent for in an emergency during the absence of the family physician.

SEC. 8.—The attending physician, at any time, may prescribe for the patient; not so the consultant, when alone, except in a case of emergency or when called from a considerable distance. In the first instance the consultant should do what is needed, and in the second should do no more than make an examination of the patient and leave a written opinion, under seal, to be delivered to the attending physician.

SEC. 9.—All discussions in consultation should be held as confidential. Neither by words nor by manner should any of the participants in a consultation assert or intimate that any part of the treatment pursued did not receive his assent.

SEC. 10.—It may happen that two physicians cannot agree in their views of the nature of a case and of the treatment to be pursued. In the event of such a disagreement, a third physician should, if practicable, be called in. None but the rarest and most exceptional circumstances would justify the consultant in taking charge of the case. He should not do so merely upon the solicitation of the patient or friends.

SEC. 11.—A physician who is called in consultation should observe the most honorable and scrupulous regard for the character and standing of the attending physician, whose conduct of the case should be justified so far as can be, consistently with a conscientious regard for truth, and no hint or insinuation should be thrown out which could impair the confidence reposed in the attending physician.

ARTICLE IV.—DUTIES OF PHYSICIANS IN CASES OF INTERFERENCE.

SECTION 1.—Medicine being a liberal profession, those admitted to its ranks should found their expectations of practice especially on the character and the extent of their medical education.